

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/994,662

Applicant(s)

LUTHI ET AL.

Examiner

Eugene L Kim

Art Unit

3721

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Eugene L Kim.

(3) C. Harmon.

(2) S. Kim.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 24 July 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, AND 9

Identification of prior art discussed: HELMSTADER

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _____.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

APPLICANT PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO OVERCOME
PREVIOUS REJECTION. REJECTION OF CLAIM 9
(INCLINER ROLLERS)
NOT PROPOSED DUE TO AXES OF ROTATION RUNNING
PARALLEL TO THE EDGE OF THE KNIFE (TOP).
AMENDMENTS WILL BE FILED WITH ARGUMENTS.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Eugene L Kim

Examiner's signature, if required